

## **REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration of the above referenced patent application in view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw all rejections. Claims 1, 4 and 5 have been amended. Claims 2 and 3 have been canceled. No claims have been added. Thus, claims 1 and 4-12 are pending.

### **35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections**

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2 and 6-10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Porterfield, US Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0016862 A1 (*Porterfield*). The Office Action alleges that *Porterfield* discloses, *inter alia*, determining a resource allocation scheme to support resource requests of peripheral devices that consumes a minimum amount of address space. The Office Action further rejects claims 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Porterfield*, based on the rejection of claim 1, in view of Arimilli et al., US Patent Application Publication No. US 2004/0215864 A1 (*Arimilli*). Specifically, *Arimilli* is alleged to disclose the distinguishing limitations of claims 11 and 12 regarding allocation and dynamic reallocation of address space for hot-plug devices. For at least the following reasons, Applicants traverse the above rejections.

### **35 U.S.C. §102(b) Rejection over *Porterfield***

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2 and 6-10 over *Porterfield*. In the *Allowed Subject Matter* section on page 4, the Office Action objects to claims 3-5 as being dependent from rejected base claims 1 and 2, while finding these claim to be otherwise allowable. Applicants amend independent claim 1 herein to incorporate the limitations of claim 3.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 as amended recites a combination of elements which the Office Action has found to be allowable. Claim 2 is

canceled herein. In depending directly or indirectly from currently amended independent claim 1, each of the remaining rejected claims 6-10 incorporate a combination of limitations which the Office Action has found to be allowable. Therefore, the above rejected claims are not anticipated by *Porterfield*, and Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of the remaining rejected claims 1 and 6-10 based on *Porterfield* be withdrawn.

### **35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejections**

#### **35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection over *Porterfield* in view of *Arimilli***

The Office Action further rejects claims 11 and 12 over *Porterfield* in view of *Arimilli*. In rejecting these claims, the Office Action relies on the above rejection of base claim 1. As discussed above, currently amended claim 1 incorporates the limitations of canceled claim 3, and thereby recites a combination of elements which the Office Action has found to be allowable. In depending directly or indirectly from currently amended independent claim 1, each of the rejected claims 11 and 12 incorporate a combination of limitations which the Office Action has found to be allowable. Therefore, Applicants submit that the above rejected claims are not obvious in light of *Porterfield* and *Arimilli*. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of claims 1, 2 and 6-10 over *Porterfield* be withdrawn.


CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the objections and rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1 and 4-12 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application. Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Date:

02-12-07

Respectfully submitted,  
**BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP**



Dermot G. Miller  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 58,309

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(503) 439-8778